

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7-11 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of May 28, 2009 all claims are rejected. With this response, claim 1 is amended. All amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments can be found at least from page 11, line 15—page 12, line 14.

Applicant acknowledges that claim 1 is amended after a final Office Action. Claim 1 is amended to comply with the requirements regarding the objection on page 3 of the Office Action, and to recite “cut off and chamfered off,” instead of “cut off or chamfered off.” Applicant would like to thank Examiner Schechter for his helpful comments during the telephone interview of August 25, 2009. During that interview applicant’s attorney discussed with Examiner Schechter amending independent claim 1 to recite “cut and chamfered.” Examiner Schechter did not believe that the cited references disclosed chamfering, but believed that such an amendment would require additional search and substantive examination. Upon further review of the claims, applicant respectfully disagrees that such amendment would require additional search and substantive examination, and respectfully requests entry and consideration of the amendment.

The previously submitted claims recited “cut or chamfered.” Therefore, the Office could have searched and examined the claims with respect to both cutting and chamfering, since claim 1 specifically recited either cutting or chamfering. Applicant respectfully submits that merely because the Office did not cite references showing chamfering does not mean that the Office did not conduct a search for references showing chamfering in relation to the other limitations of claim 1. For example, the Examiner’s Search Strategy and Results dated May 23, 2009 suggests that the Office conducted a search including cut cutting chamfer\$3 (which would include words such as chamfered and chamfering). Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the Office was previously apprised of the chamfer limitation, and already or could have already conducted a search with respect to that limitation. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to claim 1, which recites “cut and chamfer,” does not require any additional search or substantive examination on the part of the Office.

Claim Objections

In section 2, on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 is amended to recite “which is cut off” and “both said insulating layer and said passivation film,” as suggested by the Office in order to correct the informalities. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 1.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 4, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,918) in view of Takizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,074), and in further view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,160). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because the cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite that the second metallic line which is formed in the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off and chamfered off. Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The Office acknowledges on page 6 of the Office Action that Song fails to disclose that the second metallic line is formed in a side where the TFT array substrate is cut off or chamfered off, and relies upon Lee for this teaching. As mentioned above, claim 1 is amended to recite cut off and chamfered off. Lee only discloses a shorting bar (102) and cutting line (11). However, Lee is silent regarding chamfering at the cutting line (11). Instead, Lee only states that the cutting line (11) is where the substrate (10) is cut to remove the shorting bar (102). See Lee column 6, lines 28-29. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claims 7-12 ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 26 August 2009

s/Keith R. Obert/
Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955